



[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**ACTION: Emma Head**

- 3.2 CDD presented HSS performance metrics (HSPI score 2.03).
  - 3.2.1 Visibility of HIPOs and RIDDORs is enabling analysis of causes and any recurring problems, for example slips, trips and falls.
  - 3.2.2 The general position across sites was presented as positive; however, there are inconsistencies, and there was a Board desire to see data presented on a site-by-site basis.

**ACTION: [Redacted]**

**Productivity**

- 3.3 CDD presented a summary of the Bridge Report.
  - 3.3.1 Almost all areas demonstrated good progress, [Redacted]
  - 3.3.2 Weather and land acquisition has enabled some improved earth works delivery.
  - 3.3.3 [Redacted]
  - 3.3.4 [Redacted]
  - 3.3.5 [Redacted]
  - 3.3.6 Improvement initiatives are underway, including tunnel work, and there is a positive trajectory of performance against plan. The more granular S curve data analysis is now allowing management to monitor performance and intervene where required.
  - 3.3.7 [Redacted]

- 3.4 The Board expressed caution around ensuring the content and context of summaries are representative and not presenting an overly optimistic picture. Management Information should only be released when management are confident in its quality and accuracy.
  - 3.4.1 The Board suggested that, in future, the Bridge Report show further detail of any 'Red' areas at the next level down.
  - 3.4.2 The Compliance and Consents Management Information requires improvement before October Board meeting.

**ACTION: [Redacted]**

## Emerging issues (Programme Insights)

3.5 CDD gave an overview of the Programme Insights summary, explaining key issues discussed at Programme Review in the month.

[REDACTED]

3.6 CDD presented an overview of Period 4 (P4) Financial Performance.

3.6.1 [REDACTED]

3.6.2 [REDACTED]

3.7 The Board questioned whether [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

3.7.1 The Board noted that there will be a review in October, including a final profiling increase/decrease decision (as there is no inter-year flexibility this year) and planning for FY 2026/27 will also commence in October.

## 4 Reset Update (HS2B\_25-076)

### Introduction

4.1 CEO introduced the Reset Update.

4.1.1 The Reset Programme was broadly going well, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.1.2 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.1.3 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.1.4 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.2 The Board noted [REDACTED]

4.2.1 There is no management intention to rush to create tighter ranges that are not realistic. The CEO provided assurance that the work undertaken will be transparent, critically appraised, and will reflect the degree of certainty / uncertainty.

### Reset Stage 2 Close-Out

4.3 The Chief Programme Officer (CPO) introduced the Reset Stage 2 Close-Out cover paper (HS2B\_25-076).

4.4 The CPO then drew the Board's attention to three annexes: Annex A - Summary of key module assumptions; Annex B - Stage 3 - Ranges Methodology Draft 0.05; and Annex C - LoD2 feedback critical items with management response.

#### *Ranges Methodology*

4.5 It was noted that Line of Defence (LoD) 2 is due to be finished by the end of 5 September 2025, and LoD3 is due to be completed the week commencing 8 September 2025.

4.5.1 The NEDs had attended a session on the ranges methodology which suggested it was not possible to continue assurance as the work had not concluded.

4.6 More broadly, the Board expressed [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.6.1 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.7 The Board expressed the need for a feedback loop to the assurers which is not yet provided for in the documentation. The management response to the consultants' report requires further review, where there may be different viewpoints. Furthermore, a clear narrative on this process is required.

4.7.1 The consultants in question are currently considering management responses and providing further opinion.

4.7.2 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.8 The CPO gave an overview of the emerging IAAP. It was noted that:

4.8.1 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.8.2 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.9 Board noted there is no current agreement on the right quantum of assurance, including which products to assure, how best to conduct shared assurance, and what the approvals pathway should be with HMG.

4.9.1 CPO described the IAAP as in development and agreed to share the current draft with the Board.

**ACTION:** [REDACTED]

4.10 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.10.1 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.10.2 Chair and CEO agreed to discuss the positioning of this for the meeting with the Secretary of State during September.

**ACTION:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4.11 CPO explained the revised [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.12 There was a need, however, to have sufficient information to enable strategic change control, and to use this information internally only for decision making and projecting impacts on future years.

4.13 The Board was asked to **note**:

4.13.1 [REDACTED], except for the following items:

4.13.1.1. [REDACTED]

4.13.1.2. [REDACTED] and

4.13.1.3. [REDACTED].

4.13.2 that, following a specific assessment of HS2 estimating capability, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.13.2.1. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED];

4.13.2.2. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and

4.13.2.3. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and

4.13.2.4. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.14 The Board were asked to endorse:

4.14.1 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and

4.14.2 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.15 The Board noted the matters at 4.13 above and, after a discussion, agreed:

4.15.1 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] but management should summarise the documentation and provide a suitable explanatory narrative before doing so;

**ACTION: Jim Crawford**

4.15.2 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**ACTION: Jim Crawford**

4.15.3 a review of cadence for the next Board meeting(s) should be undertaken to optimise the timings of the meeting(s).

**ACTION: Company Secretariat**

## 5 Close of meeting

5.1 There being no further business the meeting was closed at 14:58.