



Ministry of Defence

Secretariat
Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Kingston Road
Sutton Coldfield
B75 7RL

E-mail: diosec-parli@mod.uk
www.gov.uk/DIO

2 June 2017

Ref. FOI2017/04453

Dear

Thank you for your email of 4 April 2017 requesting the following information:

"In terms of the relevant Freedom of Information legislation (FOI) I would be grateful if you could let me have details of the following:-

- 1] A list of MOD buildings that are laying empty and/or unused as at the date of this FOI request?*
- 2] A list of your MOD buildings that are for sale as at the date of this FOI request?*
- 3] A list of your MOD buildings that will be coming up for sale within the next 12 months starting from the date of this FOI request?*

4] Copies of the official estates management minutes relating to the last four meetings of your property committee (appropriately redacted to avoid unnecessary refusal of this FOI)?

I am requesting this information for my own personal use and will not republish it. I am looking for disused property in Norfolk to develop which is the reason for my request"

I am treating your correspondence as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

A search for the information has now been completed within the Ministry of Defence (MOD) and I can confirm that all the information in scope of your request is held.

The information for item 1, a list of MOD buildings that are lying empty and/or unused, can be found below:

Country	Derelict	Unused
ASCENSION ISLAND	0	0
BELGIUM	0	0
BELIZE	5	0
BRITISH INDIAN OCEAN TERRITORY	0	0
BRUNEI	0	0
CANADA	2	8
CYPRUS	260	32
ENGLAND	374	2066
ESTONIA	0	0

FALKLAND ISLANDS	17	2
FRANCE	0	0
GERMANY	137	21
GIBRALTAR	33	10
GUERNSEY	0	0
ISLE OF MAN	0	0
ITALY	0	0
JERSEY	0	0
KENYA	0	0
Latvia	0	0
Lithuania	0	0
NEPAL	0	0
NETHERLANDS	0	0
NORTHERN IRELAND	1	293
NORWAY	1	0
POLAND	0	0
PORTUGAL	0	0
ROMANIA	0	0
SCOTLAND	241	315
SINGAPORE	0	0
SPAIN	0	0
TURKEY	0	0
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	0	0
WALES	185	85

**** As a caveat some of the derelict buildings may be used for operational training, but are no longer maintained**

The information for items 2 and 3; a list of MOD buildings that are for sale and MOD buildings that will be coming up for sale, under Section 21 of the Act (Information reasonably accessible to the applicant by other means) you will find the information on gov.uk using the link below:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/disposal-database-house-of-commons-report>.

The information for item 4, copies of the official estates management minutes are attached in annex A, B, C and D but some of the information falls entirely within the scope of the absolute exemption provided for at sections 40 (Personal Data) of the FOIA and has been redacted.

Section 40(2) has been applied to some of the information in order to protect personal information as governed by the Data Protection Act 1998. Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is therefore no requirement to consider the public interest in making a decision to withhold the information.

Section 35 (Formulation of Government Policy) and Section 43 (Commercial Interests) have also been applied; they are qualified exemptions and are subject to public interest testing which means that the information requested can only be withheld if the public interest in doing so outweighs the public interest in disclosure. In this case it was found in the public interest to withhold as to release the information would advantage current parliamentary candidates and cause a commercial disadvantage to the MOD.

If you are not satisfied with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by

contacting the Information Rights Compliance team, Ground Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail CIO-FOI-IR@mod.uk). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain dissatisfied following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the MOD internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.ico.org.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

DIO Secretariat



Defence Infrastructure Organisation
ASP-Acquisition and Disposal (A&D)
First Floor, Bazalgette Pavilion
RAF Wyton
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE28 2EA

Tel: [REDACTED] Tel (MOD): [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]
E-mail: DIOASP-AcqDisp@[REDACTED]

RECORD OF THE MONTHLY DISPOSALS REVIEW GROUP MEETING HELD AT MAIN BUILDING, LONDON ON 03 AUGUST 2016.

Present	Name	Role
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Dir
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp1
	[REDACTED]	DIO FinComrcl-Assoc Fin Dir
	[REDACTED]	DIO Fin-TLB OpCosts 3
	[REDACTED]	DIO PPD-PD DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp3
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp4
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp6a
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp5
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1a
Apologies	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp8
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp9
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp6

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
1. Introductions/ Welcome.	1. [REDACTED] began the meeting by welcoming everyone and gave a brief explanation to the purpose of the two meetings that replaced the Disposal Steering Group.	
2. Minutes of the Last Meeting & Actions Arising.	1. Being the inaugural meeting there were no minutes of the previous meeting.	
3. Overview of Progress Against Targets.	1. Treasury had set a rolling target of £1.9bn over a 10 year period. Against the [REDACTED] 2020 target we had achieved [REDACTED] the current programme was expected to deliver a further [REDACTED] The very latest position showed that this had reduced further to [REDACTED] was asked to identify where the [REDACTED] 2. Against the in year target of [REDACTED] we were forecasting a receipt of [REDACTED] stated that the [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>control total had recently been [REDACTED]</p> <p>3. [REDACTED] advised that we were forecasting a [REDACTED] housing units against a target of 55,000 by 2020. Presently [REDACTED] of the current programme was [REDACTED]. It was expected that footprint strategy would meet this [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] as disposal sites matured which [REDACTED]</p>	
4. Disposal Programme FY16/17.	<p>1. RAF Saint Athan (6808). PUS would be meeting with his Welsh counterpart next week to discuss the matter. [REDACTED] was asked to update the IDD in light of the valuers recommendations.</p> <p>2. Rhine Barracks (2082). The LSDP was attempting to re-negotiate the agreed receipt post referendum. The IDD would be updated to reflect the [REDACTED] receipt forecast for FY17.</p> <p>3. Buckley Barracks (Hullavington) (6764). The expected receipt had [REDACTED] would forward details of estimated re-provision cost to IS which he advised would not exceed [REDACTED]</p> <p>4. Lisburn SFA Hamilton Gardens (6679) [REDACTED] would write to [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] exploring the different models of delivery for consideration.</p> <p>5. Surrey Volunteer Estate (2351). [REDACTED] was asked to support the business case in circulation for enclave funding. Concerns were raised in respect of estimated timescales for all RFCA sites. The Regional Programme Managers would be asked to review such cases.</p> <p>6. [REDACTED] (2290). The case officer would give the purchaser a further 14 days to provide proof of succession or sell to the sitting tenant. The expected forecast would be slipped to AP07 to take in to account these issues.</p> <p>7. Former RAF Driffield (6715). [REDACTED] was asked to raise a business case detailing the request for re-negotiation and proposed considerations.</p> <p>8. Copthorne Barracks 8 SLA Quarters (6795). Best & final bids post EU Referendum [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was asked to raise a business case supporting the merger of these with the sale of the Barracks (3169).</p> <p>9. [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>10. RAF Stanbridge Release of Retention (3340). The purchaser was awarded [REDACTED] by the arbitrator; the expected receipt would therefore [REDACTED] advised that any appeal would need to be based on process.</p> <p>11. Edinburgh SFA (4037). [REDACTED] would speak with [REDACTED] concerning the additional 1.5 acre of land at the site which if released [REDACTED]. As the decision relied on footprint strategy [REDACTED] would involve [REDACTED].</p> <p>12. Chalgrove Airfield (6632). The site had now transferred to HCA, [REDACTED] had been agreed. The IDD would be updated accordingly.</p> <p>13. Lisburn SFA NI Gifting (6306). [REDACTED] would request an update from [REDACTED] post meeting.</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p>5. Disposal Programme Future Years.</p>	<p>1. Waterbeach Barracks (3264). The expected receipt was due at qtr 3 calendar year; the IDD would be amended to AP09.</p> <p>2. Westminster Volunteer Estate (6618). The expected receipt [REDACTED] and the timescale slipped to 2018. The IDD would be updated.</p> <p>3. Risborough Barracks (2575). [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] speak with [REDACTED]. The discussion led to talk [REDACTED] agreed to highlight this at SLT level.</p> <p>4. DIO Aldershot (6762). [REDACTED] had spoken to the purchaser concerning the pace of the sale and alerted them to interest from another government department. An update on the situation would be given following the September PEG.</p> <p>5. RAF Newton (3002). Concerns were raised concerning the amount of work required in the forecast timescales, [REDACTED] was asked to run some of the work in parallel to ensure the sale did not slip again.</p> <p>6. Catterick Garrison/Town Centre/Training Area (3011, 3022, 3023, 3024, 3028, 3174 & 6796). [REDACTED] advised that all Catterick disposal cases had been put on hold for the forthcoming year pending the outcome of footprint strategy assessment studies. [REDACTED] questioned Harley Hill with 835 HUP as he understood it would proceed. [REDACTED] would continue stakeholder engagement and update the IDD accordingly.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>7. DIO Aldershot HUP (6763). The housing units would be scored at point of sale; this record could therefore be merged with the main record at 6762.</p> <p>8. MoD Stafford (6770). [REDACTED] would address the need for a requirements manager.</p> <p>9. 24 GPSS Sales (not in the IDD). [REDACTED] expected these would bring in a receipt of roughly [REDACTED] in FY17. Aside from 3 sites that warranted further LQA investigation they would be sold as is with any remediation work outside of legal obligation to be carried out by the purchaser. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had been allocated over 3 years to aid the sale of these sites, [REDACTED] of which had already been transferred over.</p> <p>10. Project MODEL (not in the IDD). [REDACTED] asked that the future receipts be entered in to the IDD on LSDP basis (net and gross receipts) to ensure visibility and scoring against the [REDACTED] target. [REDACTED] would discuss with [REDACTED].</p> <p>11. Redford Infantry Barracks (4031). The present record was based on historical information. [REDACTED] was waiting on confirmation of what would come forward which if full planning consent could be gained and an LSDP bought on board would dramatically increase the expected receipt. [REDACTED] asked that [REDACTED] enlist the help of [REDACTED] and actively pursue the proposal discussed. [REDACTED] suggested that a regional LSDP might provide opportunities for development at Forthside (4026) & Craigiehall (4033), he would discuss with [REDACTED].</p> <p>12. Hazebrouck Barracks (2390). The next phased sale had received bids [REDACTED] post EU Referendum. On request [REDACTED] directed [REDACTED] to invite further bids rather than hold the site. [REDACTED] had written a paper in respect of the impact of the EU Referendum vote which she would circulate next week.</p> <p>13. RAF Wyton ESA Site (3004). It was felt that the time risk should be increased to High given the present position.</p> <p>14. Royal Military School of Music Kneller Hall (6609). [REDACTED] had asked that the re-provision solution be a joint school which may [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
6. LSDP Update.	<p>1. [REDACTED] would be attending a meeting on 18 August to discuss how we record LSDP VAT. [REDACTED] would issue a note to all interested parties post meeting for action.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>2. [REDACTED] highlighted the inconsistencies in LSDP reporting and gave the example where certain LSDPs were making adjustments to their forecasts in light of the result of the EU referendum. [REDACTED] asked that this information along with other issues be forwarded to [REDACTED] for further discussion on 18 August.</p> <p>3. To ensure consistency of case officer reporting [REDACTED] was asked to confirm whether the revenue from LSDP leases could be scored against our target.</p> <p>4. [REDACTED] highlighted a revised receipt at Bordon caused by deflation; this would be reflected in the IDD post meeting.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
7. Changes to Disposal Programme Forecast.	1. [REDACTED] asked the membership to please note this new process for future meetings.	All
8. Any Other Business.	1. No issues were raised.	
9. Date of Next Meeting.	1. Work was being undertaken to streamline the numerous reports generated for the SLT and various boards. The DRG/DWG meetings would be brought in line with the new reporting schedule to ensure accurate data was conveyed. The date of the next meeting would be advised once this task was complete.	

[REDACTED]
DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1a
Secretary

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

Defence Infrastructure Organisation
ASP-Acquisition and Disposal (A&D)
First Floor, Bazalgette Pavilion
RAF Wyton
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE28 2EA

Tel: [REDACTED] Tel (MOD): [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

E-mail: DIOASP-AcqDisp [REDACTED]

RECORD OF THE MONTHLY DISPOSALS REVIEW GROUP MEETING HELD AT MAIN BUILDING, LONDON ON 13 January 2017.

Present	Name	Role
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Estates Hd DIO ASP-Acq Disp DH DIO ASP-Acq Disp1 DIO Fin-TLB OpCosts 3 DIO ASP-Acq Disp6 DIO ASP-Acq Disp5 DIO ASP-Acq Disp8 DIO ASP-Acq Disp9 DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1
Apologies	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Dir DIO FinComrcl-Assoc Fin Dir DIO Fin-TLB DH DIO PPD-PD DH DIO FIN-Ops Footprint DH

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
1. Introductions/ Welcome.	1. [REDACTED] began the meeting by welcoming everyone.	
2. Minutes of the Last Meeting & Actions Arising.	1. Events had moved on since August and as such the minutes of the last meeting were not addressed.	
3. Overview of Progress Against Targets.	1. Following correspondence outside of the meeting [REDACTED] confirmed that receipts at Hohne Barracks and Project MODEL counted towards the disposals target and therefore should be included within the IDD. 2. There was still concern that the financial position being reported by [REDACTED] did not tally with the financial position in the IDD. [REDACTED] asked that [REDACTED] arrange a meeting with herself and [REDACTED] in attendance where the issue would be talked through.	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>3. Discussions took place concerning the accounting treatments of disposal receipts. [REDACTED] confirmed that receipts equal to the Net Book Value (NBV) were classed as CDEL which then went on to fund the Capital Infrastructure Projects (CIP) whilst any money above the NBV was classed as RDEL. There were potential re-valuation opportunities during the disposal process to ensure the NBV was correct at the point of disposal which would ensure the CIP received the full benefit of receipts. There is also a need to treat the LSDP valuations differently. These issue would be addressed in a meeting due to take place shortly between [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and the finance team. In the meantime [REDACTED] had access to the NBV and would advise where immediate remedial action was needed. Alongside this the message concerning the importance of the valuation process would be passed to all case officers by the Programme Managers and LSDP leads.</p> <p>4. It was noted that the IDD pivot tables did not reflect the revised ABC Target. [REDACTED] would provide this information to [REDACTED] so it could be added alongside the existing ABC Target line.</p> <p>5. [REDACTED] confirmed that we would continue to record to the position of the programme at the end of each month and use that information to feed all reporting requirements for the month ahead. [REDACTED] forewarned all attendees that come go live in IMS our reporting capability would be severely impacted. Looking ahead until such time as the IDD was bought in to the data warehouse there would be an issue with reporting turnaround time as well as the potential loss of the pivot tables and charts.</p> <p>6. The HCA Q3 report had been collated. Following recent updates to the IDD the report [REDACTED] housing units which compared to the Q2 position was an [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] it was agreed that some [REDACTED] in the form of an [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] of the report.</p> <p>7. Further to this IH highlighted a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] over for transfer in to IMS it was agreed that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>	<p>[REDACTED] [REDACTED] & LSDP leads.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All to note</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>[REDACTED] Cases falling outside of this period would added once we were live in IMS.</p> <p>8. [REDACTED] asked that Programme Managers reiterate the importance of the housing unit programme and related evidence for scoring to all case officers and cited a case where we had lost housing units as we were unable to obtain the desired assurances in time. It was noted that there were likely to be changes to the current rules in regards to what could be scored.</p> <p>9. It was noted that proposed changes in Commercial policy might affect the ability to let contracts without competition, despite existing framework agreements.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All</p>
4. Disposal Programme FY16/17.	<p>1. CRN 6808 St Athan. Sale completed, [REDACTED] gave thanks to [REDACTED] for the assistance he provided.</p> <p>2. CRN 2623 Louisberg Barracks Bordon. Payment was overdue; [REDACTED] would hasten and update the IDD accordingly. A separate record would need to be added for the Interest.</p> <p>3. CRN 6679 Lisburn SFA. Signing of contracts has been delayed; [REDACTED] would quickly establish the position and report to [REDACTED] & [REDACTED].</p> <p>4. CRN 6793 Buckley Barracks. A bid had been received and was proceeding through the DIGA approvals process. The IDD would be updated accordingly.</p> <p>5. 3340 RAF Stanbridge. [REDACTED] advised this would complete this month. The IDD would be updated accordingly.</p> <p>6. 2290 [REDACTED]. The disposal of this site continued to slip; [REDACTED] provided further detail as to why and assured attendees that the matter was now in hand.</p> <p>7. CRN 2057 Royal Clarence Yard. [REDACTED] advised the [REDACTED] requested he provide a full case review. The IDD would be updated accordingly.</p> <p>8. e-Auction Pilot. These sales would not proceed this financial year due to issues with the commercial team and legal packs. [REDACTED] requested [REDACTED] provide a full appraisal of the position with updated timelines going forward. The IDD would be updated accordingly.</p> <p>9. CRN 3057 Gamecock Barracks. Having been rejected by the former owner the site would proceed to market. The IDD would be</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>updated with a new forecast of July/August.</p> <p>10. CRN 4027 LTPA Loch Goil. [REDACTED] confirmed this sale would occur this year. The time risk would be updated to low in the IDD.</p> <p>11. CRN 6890 Tyddesley Wood. This case was under review and would not complete as planned. The IDD would be updated accordingly.</p> <p>12. CRN 6766 Upwood Health Centre. There was uncertainty as to whether the retention may have been previously accrued or the IDD record was incorrect and required amendment. [REDACTED] would clarify with [REDACTED] and amend the IDD if required.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
5. Disposal Programme Future Years.	1. Due to a shortage of time [REDACTED] asked that programme managers notify [REDACTED] of any significant changes to the future programme for upward dissemination as appropriate.	[REDACTED]
6. LSDP Update.	<p>1. Written briefs were supplied to attendees on Bordon, Aldershot and Deepcut. There were a number of concerns in respect of Aldershot which were being monitored and addressed by [REDACTED]. An internal meeting was due to be held on 08th February, agreed changes to the programme would be reflected in the IDD.</p> <p>2. [REDACTED] was advised to submit an annual report to DIGA highlighting financial variations to the programme.</p> <p>3. LSDP leads were to note that Commercial had advised changes were needed in respect of the existing LSDP model.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
7. Changes to Disposal Programme Forecast.	1. Item not discussed.	
8. Any Other Business	<p>1. [REDACTED] provided attendees with hardcopies of the first batch of endorsed disposals that had been drawn together by SAM under Partland. [REDACTED] would consider how these could be resourced in terms of staffing as well as financially at the next Weekly ASP Team Briefing. [REDACTED] requested an electronic version.</p> <p>2. [REDACTED] would be asked to provide a written brief on the disposal cases he was leading for future meetings.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
9. Date of Next Meeting.	1. The next DRG will take place on 22 February 2017 at MoD Main Building.	All

[REDACTED]
DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1
Secretary



Defence Infrastructure Organisation
ASP-Acquisition and Disposal (A&D)
First Floor, Bazalgette Pavilion
RAF Wyton
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE28 2EA

Tel: [REDACTED] Tel (MOD): [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

E-mail: DIOASP-AcqDisp@[REDACTED]

RECORD OF THE MONTHLY DISPOSALS REVIEW GROUP MEETING HELD AT MAIN BUILDING, LONDON ON 22 February 2017.

Present	Name [REDACTED]	Role DIO ASP-Estates Hd DIO ASP-Acq Disp DH DIO ASP-Acq Disp1 DIO ASP-Acq Disp3 DIO ASP-Acq Disp5 DIO ASP-Acq Disp8 DIO FIN-Ops Footprint DH DIO SAPT-Prog Hd
Apologies	[REDACTED]	DIO FinComrcl-Assoc Fin Dir DIO PPD-PD DH DIO Fin-TLB OpCosts 3 DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
1. Introductions/ Welcome.	1. [REDACTED] began the meeting by welcoming everyone.	
2. Minutes of the Last Meeting & Actions Arising.	1. Minutes of the last meeting were accepted with no further actions (except BAU below).	
3. Overview of Progress Against Targets.	1. There was discussion about the various disposal targets which can, at times, appear confusing. DIO reported against the new 5 year target; Parliamentary target; HUP and CIP requirements. There was a need for consistent and clear reporting – the Finance Team are responsible (except for HUP which remains with A&D). 2. Monthly updates will be provided - requests for random updates should be declined. HUP will be updated quarterly once verified by HCA.	All [REDACTED] All



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>3. [REDACTED] would provide a list of discrepancies between the IDD and EO Finance Model. A workshop would be considered between Finance, EO and A&D to align forecasts.</p> <p>4. It was noted that receipts from Voluntary Estate (VE) owned disposals would continue to score against financial targets (as money in - money out) but not necessarily against the CIP. VE were also interested in estate rationalisation re-investment.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All</p>
<p>4. Accounting Treatment</p>	<p>1. There is an issue about the treatment of receipts (Gross/Net) with only Net receipts being available to meet CIP requirements.</p> <p>2. There is also an issue with the treatment of CDEL/RDEL on individual sales, relevant to the NBV, because of Accounting Standards and RICS Red Book Valuations. There is a desire to update NBV nearer to sales (e.g. because of greater planning and/or market certainty) which will be considered by Finance.</p> <p>3. [REDACTED] agreed to consider the accounting treatment of clawback and overage depending on the timing and confidence of the anticipated receipt.</p> <p>4. [REDACTED] questioned whether a shortfall in CDEL could be made up with an RDEL transfer next FY?</p> <p>5. LSDP receipts, both Gross (being Gross less an appropriate proportion of costs) and Net (being MOD gainshare), would be verified and circulated by Finance on a regular basis. Case Officers would remain responsible for updating IDD/IMS eTerrier accordingly.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All</p>
<p>5. Additional Disposal Opportunities</p>	<p>1. [REDACTED] advocated a review of Partland Opportunities; review of Training Area; further Footprint Strategy Opportunities and the acceleration of existing disposals. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] would consider the resource implications (including LMS) and value for money (VFM) considerations with the necessary planning lead-in.</p> <p>2. Stafford Site 4. Potentially ripe for development next FY but not yet declared surplus. This should be considered by [REDACTED] together with the Front Line Commands to release ASAP.</p> <p>3. Ely USVF MQs is in the process of being declared surplus.</p> <p>4. Potential review of LSDPs including forward sales and renegotiation of terms – but subject to balance of investment/opportunities and VFM considerations .</p> <p>5. The potential sale of [REDACTED]</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>[REDACTED] SON required.</p> <p>6. Copthorne Barracks. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Outline consent expected April 17.</p> <p>7. Deepcut LSDP. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] May be considered novel and contentious requiring a clear VFM case.</p> <p>8. Kings Avenue needs to be added to IDD/IMS eTerrier. Volunteer Estate receipt should be claimed by DIO.</p> <p>9. Cheshire Volunteer Estate. DIO should <u>not</u> make a claim for the receipt.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
6. Disposal Programme FY16/17.	<p>1. With [REDACTED] outstanding (including the equivalent of [REDACTED] from LMS International), disposal activity would continue to be carefully managed toward the year end but the risk of slippage to next FY was acknowledged in some individual cases.</p> <p>2. CRN 3340 – Stanbridge release [REDACTED]). High risk of slippage because legal enforcement action may be needed to resolve – requiring Comrl support.</p> <p>3. CRN 2290 – [REDACTED]). Likely to increase to [REDACTED] due to revaluation but risk of slippage. Putting pressure on purchaser.</p> <p>4. CRN 2296 – Bulford High St [REDACTED]). Likely to increase to [REDACTED] due to revaluation but risk of slippage. Putting pressure on purchaser.</p> <p>5. CRN 2057 – Royal Clarence Yard [REDACTED] Sale slipped to Sept 17.</p> <p>6. CRN 2598 – Cliff End [REDACTED]) and all other Auction sites slipped to next FY.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
7. Disposal Programme Future Years.	<p>1. [REDACTED] required that there should be a review of FY 2017 and FY 2018 receipts, including nominal and zero values, where the disposal strategy was unclear.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
8. LSDP Update.	<p>1. Waterbeach. [REDACTED] confirmed that an Outline application for the first phase of [REDACTED] units had been made (N.B. previously scored [REDACTED] units overall). Problems with the transport modelling were</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	being addressed. 2. Wyton. [REDACTED] confirmed that problems with the transport modelling had yet to be addressed. 3. Ripon/York/Grantham. [REDACTED] confirmed that Comrcl support and resource would be required to run a mini competition. 4. Arborfield. Due to a shortage of time a written brief would be circulated with the minutes.	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
9. Changes to Disposal Programme Forecast.	1. Item not discussed.	
10. Any Other Business	1. Comrc support. [REDACTED] to discuss current issues with Comrcl in view of existing frameworks. 2. [REDACTED] to remind case officers to update the IDD/IMS eTerrier, especially at this critical time of year, including the additional 'off-line' HUP risks and timing. 3. [REDACTED] was to consider the need for bespoke disposal IAC scrutiny.	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]/All [REDACTED]
11. Date of Next Meeting.	1. The next monthly DRG will take place on 28 April 2017 at MoD Main Building. 2. Meanwhile, the next quarterly DWG will take place on 22 March 2017 at MoD Main Building	All

[REDACTED]

DIO ASP-Acq Disp1 (Acting Secretary)

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

Defence Infrastructure Organisation
ASP-Acquisition and Disposal (A&D)
First Floor, Bazalgette Pavilion
RAF Wyton
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE28 2EA

Tel: [REDACTED] Tel (MOD): [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

E-mail: DIOASP-AcqDisp [REDACTED]

RECORD OF THE QUARTERLY DISPOSALS WORKING GROUP MEETING HELD AT MAIN BUILDING, LONDON ON 22 MARCH 2017.

Present	Name	Role
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Dir
	[REDACTED]	DIO FinComrcl-Assoc Fin Dir
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Estates Hd
	[REDACTED]	DIO SAPT-EStrat Hd
	[REDACTED]	DIO FIN-Ops Footprint DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO SAPT-Prog Hd
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp1
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp Snr Dev Mgr
	[REDACTED]	DIO SAPT-EStrat Optim DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO PPD-PD EO AH
	[REDACTED]	DIO Fin-TLB DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1
Apologies	[REDACTED]	DIO PPD-PD DH
	[REDACTED]	DIO Fin-Est Com Dir
	[REDACTED]	DIO SD TFM-Hd

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
1. Introductions/ Welcome.	1. [REDACTED] began the meeting by advising that he wished to discuss a number of matters not previously itemised and as such the meeting did not follow the published agenda. His concerns centred on clarity of reporting particularly in respect of LSDPs, visibility of the DEO pipeline and robustness of the existing future year's disposal programme.	
2. SLT Reporting	1. The report pack presented to the attendees did not reflect what some of the membership believed to be the current financial position of the disposal programme. Having established the reasons for the differences it was agreed that the financial accounting position would be used for all outstanding reports that remained this month. 2. Work was required to align IMS with what finance and the DEO were reporting consequently A&D would ensure all DEO pipeline	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	<p>and Partland sites were in the disposal programme with realistic forecast dates and HUP numbers. It was recognised that the reporting of the DEO pipeline was more of a challenge given its volatility. Alongside this, work would continue to update the current report pack pivot tables in line with IMS new ways of working and other business changes. It was agreed that the disposal reporting timetable would continue in its current format. A&D and Finance would work closer together to ensure an accurate picture was produced each month. In respect of the DRG/DWG meetings, they should ideally occur immediately before each monthly run to ensure that the most up to date information is being utilised. [REDACTED] requested that future meeting packs include a one page brief for each LSDP providing details on current position, future projections and longer term issues. Finance would lead on this requirement.</p> <p>3. It was recommended that the LSDP Gross receipts should commonly become known as "Government Land Sales" scored against our Parliamentary targets, whilst the LSDP Net receipts (and other sales' Gross accrued receipts) should commonly and collectively become known as "CIP sales values" available for use by the CIP (notwithstanding any CDEL/REDL accounting issues). Following formal sign off by the Chairperson at the DRG/DWG forum both Gross and Net values would be reported for the month ahead with appropriate footnotes to avoid any confusion. It was noted that from herein LSDPs would be reported on an accruals hectares basis.</p> <p>4. [REDACTED] advised that she and others were looking at the best way of reporting KPIs and milestones. Presently this was only done for the top 15 sites by value.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All To Note</p>
3. Disposal Programme Future Year's.	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>2. [REDACTED] reinforced the need for case by case scrutiny of the programme at the DRG meeting. Issues that would affect the anticipated completion date of each disposal needed to be drawn out and worked through to ensure that Government targets were met.</p> <p>3. [REDACTED] could not provide certainty of the receipt at Waterbeach Barracks Yr3 (ID 3264) until the next PEG meeting which was due to take place tomorrow.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>All To Note</p>

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

<u>Item</u> (a)	<u>Discussion and Decision</u> (b)	<u>Action</u> (c)
	4. Chalgrove Airfield (ID 6801) [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Completed
4. DEO Pipeline	<p>1. The membership discussed whether there were opportunities to take forward certain aspects of the pipeline to assist with the immediate shortfall. Dalton Barracks, Woolwich and Hounslow and South Cerney were included amongst those discussed. [REDACTED] advised that the pipeline programme had recently been re-prioritised but no firm decisions could be made on any of the sites until gateway approval had been gained. [REDACTED] would look at whether some of these or the Partland sites could be disposed of without eroding their value on a forward sell basis.</p> <p>2. [REDACTED] advised that, alongside front line command buy-in, one of the biggest risks to advancing the pipeline programme was lack of resource (i.e. funding and staffing) and until such time as this was addressed it would not improve. [REDACTED] reinforced the need for proper pipeline management.</p> <p>3. Given the uncertainty surrounding disposals on the RFCA estate and treatment of the receipts, whilst they would count against the [REDACTED] target they were not likely to count against the CIP. [REDACTED] advised they should not be relied upon.</p>	[REDACTED]
10. Any Other Business	1. None raised	
11. Date of Next Meeting.	<p>1. The next monthly DRG will take place on 28 April 2017 at MoD Main Building.</p> <p>2. Meanwhile, the next quarterly DWG will take place on 21 June 2017 at MoD Main Building</p>	All To Note

[REDACTED]

DIO ASP-Acq Disp1a1 (Secretary)

[REDACTED]